



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,478	06/21/2007	Peter Siig	900.46373X00	9714
20457 7590 02/06/2009 ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET SUITE 1800 ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873				
EXAMINER				
HURLEY, SHAUN R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3765				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/06/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/590,478

Applicant(s)

SIIG, PETER

Examiner

Shaun R. Hurley

Art Unit

3765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 November 2008 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on 13 November 2008. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 9-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedegaard (6701756) in view of Mustacich et al (6490852).

Hedegaard teaches a method for securing a fur on a pelting board which is temporarily fastened in a pelting board holder, wherein the fur is stretched on the pelting board to a desired length and fixed thereto without damaging the fur (Abstract; Figure 4). While Hedegaard essentially teaches the invention as detailed, he fails to specifically teach wrapping an elastic (inherent of the material taught) band around the central material via a displaceable winding unit having a stoppable supply reel and movable around the central material on a guide ring, which Mustacich teaches (Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have utilized such a winding mechanism, so as to temporarily fasten a material in a known manner. Hedegaard teaches using a sleeve to hold the fur in place without damage, but the ordinarily skilled artisan would have understood that any manner of product could be used that would create a pressure on the outside of fur against the pelting board to temporarily fasten them, including wrapping a length of elastic material.

Mustacich teaches us that such mechanisms to wrap elastic material are already known and understood, and the ordinarily skilled artisan would have found it obvious to try combining the two, so as to create a temporary fastening means for the fur to the pelt. In regards to the band locking to itself, knot tying is well known and well within the ordinarily skilled artisan's abilities. With regards to the fur remaining in a stretched position, it would obviously since the winding would not have been removed.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 13 November 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Hedegaard teaches a sleeve/paper bag and that as such, there is no reliance upon elasticity or winding material to retain the fur. Examiner notes that he never relied upon Hedegaard to teach either. Hedegaard teaches the basic pelting board, and as figure 4 shows, the bag, as well as details 14, act to retain the pelt. While details 14 are used, the ordinarily skilled artisan would be more than capable of utilizing any other means to retain the end of the pelt, and Mustacich is cited to demonstrate one such manner. Mustacich teaches that it is known to wrap internal structures with a strand of material, so as to insulate and keep said structures together by application of pressure. Applicant argues that this combination is invalid since Mustacich does not pander pelts and the like. Examiner's argument is that Mustacich teaches a well known manner of bundling structures, which is precisely what the ordinarily skilled artisan would want to accomplish with the pelt board and fur. It must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of

ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shaun R. Hurley whose telephone number is (571) 272-4986. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8:00 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Welch can be reached on (571) 272-4996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shaun R Hurley
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3765

SRH
02 February 2009

/Shaun R Hurley/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3765